



SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT AND CLIMATE DAYS AT COP 16: 4-5 DECEMBER 2010

The “Development and Climate Days at COP 16” event was held at the Caribe Park Royal Grand Hotel in Cancún, Mexico, from 4-5 December 2010. The event took place in parallel with the sixteenth Conference of the Parties (COP 16) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and sixth Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP 6).

Development and Climate Days has been a feature of the UNFCCC negotiations since 2002. It provides an opportunity for participants to share information on key development and climate change issues. In Cancún, several hundred participants attended the two-day event, including representatives of governments, international organizations, academia, research institutes, business and non-governmental organizations. The event was organized by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), Ring Alliance of policy research organizations, and Capacity Strengthening of Least Developed Countries for Adaptation to Climate Change (CLACC). Sponsors and supporters of the 2010 event included the Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS); Brot für die Welt (Bread for the World); Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN); Comic Relief; Fairtrade Foundation; International Development Research Centre (IDRC); Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD); UK Department for International Development (DfID); and United Nations University (UNU).

The event featured more than 40 speakers and numerous extended discussions and question-and-answer sessions. Sessions focused on the following issues:

- low-carbon, resilient development;
- adaptation (including community-based institutions, planning, assessment and financing);
- climate change communications;
- the Fairtrade movement and climate change; and
- climate change and migration.

The event also included a film festival on climate and development issues, featuring short films from around the world.

This report of Development and Climate Days at COP 16 summarizes the presentations and discussions held over the two days.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

Until fairly recently, climate change was viewed largely as an environmental concern of little relevance to development policy makers or practitioners. Likewise, development considerations were given less attention than technological and natural science approaches focusing on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Nevertheless, unsustainable development is the underlying cause of climate change, and development pathways will determine the degree to which social systems are vulnerable to climate change.

Climate change has direct impacts on development with regard to climate-sensitive activities such as agriculture and indirect consequences on social issues such as poverty and education. Furthermore, climate change is likely to exacerbate inequalities due to the uneven distribution of damage, since poor communities tend to live on marginal lands and in areas prone to extreme weather events. Alternative development pathways will influence the capacity of communities and countries to adapt to climate change and will also determine future greenhouse gas emissions. As such, development policy and practice must address climate change issues.

Development and Climate Days began as “Adaptation Day” in 2002 to discuss some of these emerging issues. The “Development Day” component was added in 2004 to bring in development practitioners who would not normally attend UNFCCC negotiations but who had relevant information to share, and whose work might be influenced by the climate change community. In 2007, the event was renamed “Development and Climate Days” to reflect that adaptation had become increasingly mainstreamed into the development

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of Climate Change and Development Issues	1
Report of Development and Climate Days at COP 16	2
Day One	2
Day Two	5
Close of the Meeting	8
Upcoming Meetings	8
Glossary	9

The *Development and Climate Days Bulletin* is a publication of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) <info@iisd.ca>, publishers of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org>. This issue was written and edited by Leonie Gordon and Chris Spence. The Editor is Mark Schulman <mark@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. Support for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the meeting organizers, supporters and sponsors (for the list of organizations, see the introduction to this summary, above). IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in other publications with appropriate academic citation. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are sent to e-mail distribution lists (in HTML and PDF formats) and can be found on the Linkages WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/>. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11A, New York, New York 10022, United States of America.

agenda and that good adaptation presupposes development. The renaming of the event also sought to reflect the fact that climate change and development are linked both through adaptation and mitigation.

The most recent Development and Climate Days prior to Cancún was held in parallel with COP 15 in Copenhagen, Denmark. This event focused on land, water and forests; justice, ethics and humanitarian issues; adaptation planning; and mitigation, finance and the private sector.

REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT AND CLIMATE DAYS AT COP 16

DAY ONE

Development and Climate Days at COP 16 opened on Saturday morning, 4 December. On the first day, participants met in four sessions on: low-carbon, resilient development; the role of community-based institutions in adaptation; adaptation planning; and communicating climate change.

Richard Klein, Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), welcomed participants to Development and Climate Days at COP 16, and served as master of ceremonies on the first day. He explained that the event aims not only to generate a better understanding of the various linkages between development and climate change, but also serves as an opportunity to connect those working on these issues.

SESSION ONE: LOW-CARBON, RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT

This session focused on low-carbon, resilient development, and in particular the lessons learned from early implementation. The session was organized by IISD and OECD, and chaired by IISD's John Drexhage, who noted the enormous economic growth in developing countries and the need to shift towards clean energy. He drew attention to nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs), an evolving concept first articulated in the 2007 Bali Action Plan adopted at COP 13 and dealing with voluntary developing country actions to reduce emissions. He noted three general principles for NAMAs: the level of ambition should be commensurate with the level of development; a registry will link developing country mitigation actions to developed country support; and the level and type of support will depend on the NAMA in question. Finally, he noted IISD's work on NAMAs in the context of fossil fuel subsidies, least developed countries, fast emerging developing economies (such as Indonesia and Viet Nam), and public procurement to advance NAMAs for energy.

Presentations: Christa Clapp, OECD Environment Directorate, spoke about low emission development strategies (LEDS). She said LEDS should address both climate and development, involve senior economic policy makers, and have identified sources of financial support. She concluded that

LEDS have value for domestic and international stakeholders, that they should not slow down NAMAs, and that they should not become a precondition for financing.

Liana Bratasida, Assistant Minister for Global Environmental Affairs and International Cooperation, Ministry of Environment, Indonesia, shared Indonesia's experience with NAMAs. Noting Indonesia's ambitious mitigation targets announced in late 2009, she highlighted various challenges, including: regional and national coordination; data and information gathering and verification; and capacity building, particularly for developing regional action plans. She emphasized the need for leadership at the national and regional government levels.

Dennis Tirpak, World Resources Institute, described a joint project with the German Technical Cooperation Agency GmbH (GTZ) and the Indonesian Government on a NAMA for Indonesian cities. He said urban areas currently account for about 50% of the world population and 80% of growth in energy use, and highlighted their potential role as a policy tool in national emissions reduction efforts. He outlined the major elements of a city NAMA, including a standard protocol to assess a city's emissions, an inventory, emissions projections, target setting, and both short- and long-term financing.

Peter Akong Minang, Alternatives to Slash and Burn Partnership, World Agroforestry Centre (ASB-ICRAF), discussed the convergence of approaches being undertaken on NAMAs, reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries (REDD) and the land use sector. Noting that land use issues are the entry point for NAMAs in most developing countries, he called for a broad land use perspective and mechanisms that jointly address adaptation and mitigation.

Discussion: In the ensuing discussion, panelists emphasized that NAMAs and LEDS are not mutually exclusive, and John Drexhage suggested that NAMAs are the building blocks for LEDS.

Responding to a question about funding sources for energy development, Dennis Tirpak urged looking at all funding sources, both internal and external. Citing pilot projects on REDD in Viet Nam that raise proceeds for local communities from fees on tourism, electricity production and water, he said such fee structures are more sustainable in the long term than assuming unending donor support. Peter Akong Minang said developing countries must be more strategic, suggesting that most countries could be more proactive in accessing energy funding under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).

For more information, contact:

John Drexhage <jdrexhage@iisd.ca>

SESSION TWO: WHAT IS THE ROLE FOR COMMUNITY-BASED INSTITUTIONS IN ADAPTATION?

This session was organized by the Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS) and International Development Research Centre (IDRC). Atiq Rahman, BCAS, chaired the session, observing that the dialogue on adaptation has strengthened in the past decade. He said climate change is compounding existing development challenges, and stressed development as the best antidote to climate change impacts. Noting that the effects of climate change are non-linear and exponential, he highlighted serious challenges for food security, funding, water policy and migration. In terms of funding, he said it is hard to push money down to the local level. He



Richard Klein, Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), served as master of ceremonies for the first day's events.



Atiq Rahman, Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS).

compared funding to a helium balloon – it tends to rise up, and if you inflate it too much it can collapse, much like Wall Street with the financial crisis.

Presentations: Two speakers reported on livelihood adaptation to climate impacts in Bangladesh. Golam Rabbani, BCAS, outlined efforts focused on agriculture and water, which had helped link local communities, researchers, local government and NGOs. Anwara Begum, Caritas Bangladesh, said projects in Bangladesh had improved water-use efficiency in agriculture and diversified income streams, particularly for women. She added that the projects had also improved irrigation systems and promoted salt-tolerant rice varieties and other crops, and had empowered and encouraged communities. She recommended expanding these pilot activities.

Eric Kisiangani, Practical Action Kenya, reported on a two-year project aimed at enhancing the adaptive capacity of communities of pastoralists in northern Kenya. He explained that the project had adopted a participatory action research (PAR) approach that had supported research and helped “put research into action.” He said the PAR approach had built relationships among relevant communities and empowered local institutions.

Imad-eldin Ali Babiker, Agricultural Research Corporation (ARC-Sudan), presented on rainfed farming in Sudan, focusing on a study on sorghum crops in Gedarif state. Noting a productivity decrease between 1970 and 2008, he described steps taken to reduce vulnerability and enhance agricultural productivity, including introducing mechanized procedures and stakeholder engagement.

Assize Toure, Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE), Senegal, presented on a platform to help vulnerable communities adapt to climate change. On lessons learned, he emphasized: establishing mutual trust with local populations; valuing local knowledge; using simple terms and tools so they are accessible to local communities; establishing producer organizations; and utilizing NGOs as an entry point for local population adaptation.

Elvin Nyukuri, African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS), Kenya, spoke on a project aimed at strengthening community-based adaptation through local institutions in Kenya, Uganda and Zimbabwe. She emphasized the value of encouraging partnerships between informal processes and formal interventions, linkages to and between institutions, and wise use of land and water resources.

Discussion: In the ensuing discussion, participants and panelists highlighted: addressing how to understand spontaneous autonomous adaptation; the challenge of downscaling to the local level; understanding where local knowledge has limitations; and evaluating baselines.

Summing up the discussions, Atiq Rahman emphasized the need to distinguish between traditional development and climate-related adaptation, stating “not everything is necessarily climate change.”

For more information, contact:

Atiq Rahman <atiq.rahman@bcas.net> and Evans Kituyi <ekituyi@idrc.or.ke>

BOOK ANNOUNCEMENT: On Saturday afternoon, 4 December, a representative of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) announced the organization’s first book, *Climate Change Adaptation and International Development: Making Development Cooperation More Effective*.

SESSION THREE: ADAPTATION PLANNING

This session focused on how to develop planning priorities and how to implement them. It was chaired by Nanki Kaur, IIED, who noted that adaptation planning discussions were taking place in numerous fora, including several UNFCCC bodies, as well as by the World Bank, governments and other stakeholders. She noted the breadth of the adaptation discourse, including a focus on inclusiveness, the value of both scientific and local knowledge, community-based and ecosystem-based adaptation, the integrative approach, and the gender dimension.

Presentations: Aarjan Dixit, World Resources Institute (WRI), discussed the National Adaptive Capacity (NAC) framework, which he described as a “functions-based approach to adaptation planning.” He said NAC functions include assessment, prioritization, coordination, information management and risk reduction. On prioritization, he said this must be a participatory and transparent process that is open to review. In terms of uses, he said the NAC framework could assess institutional strengths and gaps; set an adaptive capacity baseline; and establish institutional or process-based indicators for tracking progress over time.

Alexander Fröde, GTZ, spoke about climate proofing for development, outlining experiences with GTZ’s approach for integrating climate change into development. He explained that their methodology seeks to analyze current and future climate challenges in the context of policy or project planning and to identify and prioritize options for action. He added that work has been taking place at the national, sectoral, project and local levels. He identified lessons learned to date, including the need to: translate scientific data into “take home messages”; find a suitable entry point for engagement; allow sufficient time to plan, discuss and decide; identify all relevant stakeholders; involve stakeholders at the right moment; and include sufficient expertise among those involved.

Javier Gonzales Iwanciw, Nur University, Bolivia, reflected on Bolivia’s experiences with mainstreaming from the bottom up. He said the bottom-up process was motivated by a desire to make ecosystems more robust, enhance the resilience and sustainability of productive systems, and strengthen organizational capacities. He identified several lessons learned, including that climate impacts are part of the problem but practices are already unsustainable (for instance, water use).



Javier Gonzales Iwanciw, Nur University, Bolivia.

He stressed the value of linking research, policy and action, and highlighted the difficulties of scaling up successful projects quickly.

Shepard Zvigadza, ZERO Regional Environment Organisation, presented on the role of civil society in supporting adaptation planning in Kenya, Uganda and Zimbabwe. He said NGOs contribute to adaptation strategies through: communicating their knowledge of communities' aspirations and indigenous systems; packaging these messages and ensuring they are known at the political level; sharing future adaptation outcomes; and working closely with the media in disseminating the results of research findings.

Gyanendra Karki, Nepal NAPA team, Ministry of Environment, and Jess Ayers, IIED, shared experiences in developing the Nepal NAPA, with Karki emphasizing that it is viewed as a process rather than a project and is intended, *inter alia*, to create a multistakeholder platform for action. Ayers praised the Government of Nepal, as one of the most recent countries to develop its NAPA and for learning from other countries' experiences. She described the establishment of six multi-sectoral thematic working groups designed to generate local stakeholder engagement. She then described the bottom-up approach to coordinated and integrated planning. She also noted that the NAPA has provided a platform to enable donors to take a coordinated approach to funding.

Discussion: In the ensuing discussion, participants focused on emerging trends in adaptation planning and ideas for good practice, with participants emphasizing, *inter alia*, local community involvement and the need to link adaptation activities to national planning processes. Opinions varied on how best to connect the local to the national, regional and international levels, with Javier Gonzales Iwanciw noting barriers, including an emphasis on sectoral approaches within the UNFCCC process. Alexander Fröde stressed the need to work within the sectoral nature of existing governmental systems, whereas Jess Ayers referred to Nepal's success in adopting a cross-sectoral approach. On how to engage finance ministries rather than environment ministries, which are often considered "weaker," Jess Ayers emphasized the latter's role in providing technical expertise and coordination.

For more information, contact:
Nanki Kaur <nanki.kaur@iied.org>

SESSION FOUR: COMMUNICATING CLIMATE CHANGE: WHAT KNOWLEDGE AND WHOSE KNOWLEDGE COUNTS?

Mike Shanahan, IIED, chaired this session. He started by asking participants questions about the focus of their work. The one question to which everyone raised his or her hand was "Have you in the last year had to communicate to someone about climate change?" He invited selected participants to share their experiences communicating climate change.

Presentations: William Chadza, Centre for Environmental Policy and Advocacy, Malawi, stressed the need to select the most relevant channel for the intended audience. For instance, he said a different channel may be appropriate in trying to reach policy makers than, say, vulnerable populations in remote areas.

Jo-Ellen Parry, IISD, explained that IISD's work is policy-based, so its communications are targeted towards reaching and influencing policy makers.

Chris Spence, IISD, spoke about IISD Reporting Services' publications, which seek to create transparency and accountability in multilateral environmental processes. The stable of products includes:

- conference reports (such as *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* and the for-hire "*Your Meeting*" *Bulletin*);
- regional initiatives covering events in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean; and
- "knowledge management" products such as the *Climate Change Daily Feed* (climate-l.iisd.org).

Moussa Na Abou Mamouda, ENDA, Senegal, highlighted the use of traditional and innovative ways to raise local communities' awareness, such as the use of drama, theater and community radio. At the local level, he stressed the need to make complex, unfamiliar issues both relevant and accessible.

Bettie Luwuge, Tanzania Forest Conservation Group, outlined communication activities using drama, music and theater groups. She said messages must be in straightforward language that is accessible to all people. She also said the fact that Tanzania has a national language (Swahili) makes it easier to communicate with people. She identified various tools, including basic print media such as pamphlets.

Discussion: In the ensuing discussion, one participant highlighted the considerable challenge for communicators in influencing very different constituencies and getting the message right for each. Several participants noted the difficulty in translating the unwieldy "jargon" in this field into something accessible to the public. One cited the example of the word "stakeholders," which is not widely used by the general public.



Bettie Luwuge, Tanzania Forest Conservation Group, during the session on communicating climate change.

Mike Shanahan said sometimes the best approach is not even to mention climate change. For instance, he said journalists he knows sometimes find it easier to persuade an editor to publish a story if they pitch it as a health or economic issue.

One participant said many groups develop manuals and guides, but asked who actually learns from these? Another highlighted the value of making personal contacts, and underscored the impact of “meet and greet” opportunities.

On how we communicate, a participant said most current activities are one dimensional and linear. He argued for the use of well-designed games that engage people and involve them in thinking more deeply about the problem and solutions. Several people supported this idea, while one said these need to be placed in a cultural context, and may not be applicable to people of all ages. This person added that we must value relevant indigenous existing knowledge, for instance on weather patterns and seasons.

One participant compared most communications to the “fast food” (as opposed to “slow food”) culture. He said a more thoughtful process that builds genuine interest and encourages issue champions yields results. He noted work with parliamentarians and youth. A participant from the media stressed focusing on stories happening on the ground from countries experiencing droughts and other climate change impacts, which climate skeptics cannot dispute. Several speakers also highlighted the potential use of social media and the value of training journalists to break through the jargon and acquaint them with the UNFCCC process.

Reflecting on the discussions, Mike Shanahan summarized comments, which included the need to: tailor messages appropriately; identify the right intermediary; use the internet and other new technologies; avoid too much “fast food” information; find one’s “inner child” using games and stories to help communicate messages; think about how people learn and the psychology of communicating climate change; and not always talk about climate change, but instead talk about real events happening to real people.

For more information, contact:

Mike Shanahan <mike.shanahan@iied.org>

DAY TWO

On 5 December, the second and final day of Development and Climate Days at COP 16, four sessions were held. These sessions focused on Fairtrade and climate change; evaluating adaptation; climate change and forced migration; and financing adaptation and climate compatible development.

Saleemul Huq and Hannah Reid, IIED, served as the masters of ceremonies. Saleemul Huq noted that the “Development Day” component was added to this event several years ago to encourage people to attend UNFCCC negotiations who may not otherwise have done so. In this regard, he welcomed members of the Fairtrade community to the 2010 event.

SESSION ONE: A FAIR CLIMATE FOR FARMERS: WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM FAIRTRADE?

This session was organized by Fairtrade Africa (AFN) and chaired by David Dodman, IIED. He explained that this session presented an opportunity to consider the relevance of Fairtrade and its role in adaptation, trade justice and climate justice.



Balgis Osman Elasha, African Development Bank.

Presentations: Marcela Guerrero Casas, AFN, provided some background on Fairtrade Labeling Organizations (FLOs). She articulated their vision of a world in which all producers can enjoy secure and sustainable livelihoods. She outlined the work of FLO International, a Bonn-headquartered group that sets international Fairtrade standards and supports 1.2 million producers, particularly small-scale farmers and organized workers, in 60 countries.

Carlos Canales, FLO International, presented a climate change strategy that seeks to help disadvantaged producers to prepare for climate change challenges and position Fairtrade as an important tool for addressing climate change. He explained that their strategy has four components: research and development; support programmes for producers; assessing Fairtrade’s impact on climate change; and awareness raising and advocacy. On research to date, he said findings include observable changes in growing seasons, increases in pests, diseases and storms, and lower production levels. He said four of the six key Fairtrade crops (coffee, cocoa, tea and bananas) were considered to be at higher risk.

Carlos Eugenio Vargas, Fairtrade Latin America & Caribbean (CLAC), outlined CLAC’s work with more than 300 organizations in 21 countries. He highlighted CLAC’s environmental planning, called for an international, binding treaty that enforces emission reductions from the North, and said producers in the South are already paying the price for climate change.

Tomy Mathew, Fair Trade Alliance of Kerala, India, said the experience of farmers shows that climate change is happening here and now. He described Fairtrade benefits for producers, including that farmers have been able to diversify, shift away from monocropping and support biodiversity as a result of stable prices and the “social premium” (additional funds above the minimum Fairtrade price that are paid by importers directly to producers for investment in community economic and social development). He also suggested that organic farming is only sustainable with fair market access.

Noel Oettlé, Environmental Monitoring Group, described how climate change threatens Kenya’s small-scale tea industry, citing that the Iriaini Tea Factory Company in central Kenya has used Fairtrade resources to move to other activities such as beekeeping and alternative crops like sunflowers. He also spoke about the Heiveld Cooperative, which was formed by small-scale farmers in the Suid Bokkeveld in South Africa, describing its joint marketing channel and management process for fairly traded wild rooibos tea. In conclusion, he asserted, *inter alia*, that: Fairtrade creates an enabling environment for adaptation and fosters pride and enthusiasm to adapt; and

cooperatives and networks can create platforms, opportunities and policies for collective knowledge management and action as well as attract external support.

Noting that Malawi's economy is entirely dependent on agriculture, Dyborn Chibonga, National Smallholder Farmers' Association of Malawi (NASFAM), described NASFAM's adaptation response to climate change, which includes creating Fairtrade standards and practices and special programmes on conservation agriculture, as well as participation in reforestation.

Discussion: Responding to a question about certification costs, Tomy Mathew said it is costly but has significant benefits. He also observed that a fund has been established to help producers become certified. On a question about Fairtrade fisheries, he said they are controversial and involve a number of important stakeholders, but are being discussed. On whether Fairtrade creates export dependencies in India, Tomy Mathew said Fairtrade is not restricted to Western markets, since India itself is viewed as a new market for these products. Noel Oetle noted a growing number of Fairtrade outlets in South Africa.

On a question about the effects on crop diversification, Dyborn Chibonga said farmers in Malawi are advised to maintain 60% of their land for cash crops and 40% for food. Tomy Mathew said there is large-scale use of cash crops for security in Kerala. On a participant's comment about the potential for accessing carbon credits, Tomy Mathew said the opportunities are there but adequate systems are not yet in place.

For more information, contact:

David Dodman <david.dodman@iied.org> and Marcela Guerrero Casas <m.guerrero@fairtradeafrica.net>

SESSION TWO: EVALUATING ADAPTATION

This session was organized by IIED and OECD and chaired by OECD's Stephen Groff.

Presentations: Shardul Agrawala, OECD, spoke about monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of adaptation, focusing on M&E at the system level. He began by observing that there can be many different objectives behind M&E, from *ex ante* assessment and screening for specific options to ensuring fiduciary accountability. He suggested that at least some of the complexity in this area results from these different objectives, and that adaptation itself remains a nebulous concept. He also outlined OECD's work. He highlighted "unpacking/deepening"



Mike Shanahan, IIED.

the component elements of the programmatic approach. He also discussed formalizing observed progress in the national context into standardized evaluation frameworks.

Simon Anderson, IIED, spoke about climate change adaptation M&E at the local scale. He explained that M&E can help in terms of accountability, effectiveness, learning, planning, mainstreaming and value for money. It can also assist in assessing climate effects on development scenarios.

Gehendra Gurung, Practical Action, Nepal, spoke about identifying tools and methodologies for community-based vulnerability assessment in Nepal. He outlined work and relevant tools to measure vulnerability based on assessed levels of exposure to climate change, system sensitivity and adaptive capacity.

Carmenza Robledo, Environment and Climate Change Group, Intercooperation, spoke of her experiences in evaluating adaptation in Latin America. Noting that climate change adds an additional burden to the development challenge, she said methods used for monitoring development are useful for monitoring adaptation. However, she stressed the need to specify, and if possible quantify, the additional burden. Noting that monitoring can have a range of objectives, she said these require different but complementary frameworks.

Timmons Roberts, Brown University, proposed three key criteria in the context of M&E, including that it should: reach those most in need; allow them to take useful actions; and avoid negative side-effects. He called for a normative framework for climate financing. Highlighting the inadequacy of current country reporting, he called for, *inter alia*: agreed definitions; inclusion of project details; third party verification; and consideration of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) as a system to support monitoring and reporting climate finance.

Summarizing some of the key points made by presenters, Stephen Groff highlighted: the complexity of evaluation processes, in particular the multiplicity of objectives; the need to get it right at the local level to satisfy global or national objectives; and increased donor focus on achieving "value for money."

Discussion: In the ensuing discussion, one participant supported including time scales in adaptive capacity measures. Another asked how adaptation can be established as a public good, with Timmons Roberts responding that this is difficult to achieve and that doing so could present adaptation as "charitable" rather than an obligation. Gehendra Gurung provided examples from Nepal of baselines used to monitor whether projects have reduced the worst impacts of climate change and increased the adaptive capacity of the community.

For more information, contact:

Shardul Agrawala <shardul.agrawala@oecd.org>

SESSION THREE: CLIMATE CHANGE AND FORCED MIGRATION

This session was organized by Bread for the World and the United Nations University (UNU). It was chaired by Koko Warner, UNU, who identified four climate change "pathways" that may affect migration: intensified acute natural disasters that lead to temporary and permanent displacement; rising sea levels that inundate coastal areas and may prove particularly harmful to low lying deltas and island countries; intensified drought and desertification that adversely affects livelihoods; and competition for natural resources that results in intensified



L-R: Koko Warner, UNU; Sophia Wirsching, Bread for the World; Daniel Schensul, UNFPA; and Peter Emberson, Pacific Conference of Churches.

conflict (which in turn causes mass displacement). She identified various migration patterns, including emergency displacement resulting from acute disasters or conflict, and gradual displacement resulting from drought, desertification, sea-level rise or other factors. She also noted that most migration was internal and over short distances, rather than external.

Presentations: Sophia Wirsching, Bread for the World, reported on recent events in the Pacific. She expressed concern at inadequate action on the links between migration and climate change at the national and international levels. She reflected on the experience of the Carteret Islanders, whose land is being inundated by ocean, resulting in resettlement.

Daniel Schensul, UN Population Fund (UNFPA), reported that many parts of the UN system have been engaging on this issue. He observed that climate change was having an impact on existing migration flows and that there has been considerable migration in developing countries to coastal urban areas that are vulnerable to climate change. He advocated a rights-based approach, highlighting the needs of displaced persons and refugees.

Peter Emberson, Pacific Conference of Churches, provided some insights on how climate impacts are being addressed in the Pacific. He noted that many Pacific Islanders define themselves through their spiritual connection to their homeland, meaning that local and national politicians who talk about resettlement risk of committing “political suicide.” He also highlighted the critical role of the church in finding solutions, since over 80% of the population in this region is Christian. Finally, he urged moving beyond generating good research and data collection and accelerating policy making and action.



Celine Herweijer, CDKN.

Discussion: One participant highlighted the difficulties of assessing climate-induced migration risks given their unpredictability, and Koko Warner suggested the next generation of research should isolate the “independent variable” in considering climate change/risk management interaction. Participants also noted that migration is just one response to risk, with one saying climate-induced migration is not generally permanent and another noting that it can be adaptation but has the added effect of alienating people from their resources and social and cultural networks. Another lamented the lack of political will to address climate-induced migration both within the UNFCCC discussions and elsewhere.

Participants also discussed security and humanitarian responses to migration in the event of severe weather conditions and sea-level rises in areas such as Bangladesh. One participant called for research on sovereignty and other legal ramifications of mass climate-induced migration from low-level regions, both within countries and across borders. Responding to a proposal that Pacific Island States could create a regional grouping similar to the European Union to address resettlement, Peter Emberson referred to the seasonal workers migrants’ scheme for migrant fruit pickers as an existing cooperation mechanism in the region.

For more information, contact:

Koko Warner <warner@ehs.unu.edu> and Sophia Wirsching <s.wirsching@brot-fuer-die-welt.org>

SESSION FOUR: FINANCING ADAPTATION AND CLIMATE COMPATIBLE DEVELOPMENT

This session was chaired by IIED’s Simon Anderson and organized by IIED and the Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN).

Presentations: Celine Herweijer, CDKN and PwC, outlined CDKN’s work supporting the UN Secretary-General’s High-Level Advisory Group on Climate Financing (AGF), which was set up in February 2010 to identify how industrialized countries could mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020 to support climate-resilient development in the developing world. She reviewed the key messages of the AGF’s recently-published report, including that the US\$100 billion goal is challenging but achievable, that a transparent and credible carbon price of at least US\$20-25 per tonne is needed to drive public and private financing, and that international cooperation is needed to ensure that funding instruments are efficient and effective. In terms of opportunities for action across all regions, she identified: auctioning (rather than giving away) emission allowances in developed countries; redirecting



Hassan Mahmood, Minister for Environment and Forests, Bangladesh.

fossil fuel subsidies; carbon pricing international transport; strengthening and deepening carbon markets; and using public-sector mechanisms to leverage private capital.

Remy Paris, OECD, noted the Copenhagen Accord's inclusion of fast start financing of US\$30 billion for the period 2010 to 2012, which he said is now beginning to flow. Stating that OECD wants to build trust and transparency, he identified characteristics of good climate financing, which he said should be adequate, predictable, sustained and complementary with existing development funding. He also highlighted the key principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, including ownership, alignment, capacity development, harmonization and managing for development results. He concluded that political will and innovation are needed to mobilize sufficient resources, and said we should draw lessons from 50 years of development experience.

Marion Verles, Nexus, reflected on financing for smaller-scale climate responses. Noting that there are many initiatives by grassroots organizations on the ground, she described Nexus as a "bottom-up initiative by development practitioners" and described its partnerships, funding and activities. She noted that the boundaries between mitigation and adaptation are not always clear, and stressed that the carbon market is not limited to the CDM, with innovations coming from the voluntary market and elsewhere.

Tomonori Sudo, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), presented on climate change financing mechanisms in Japan. He emphasized, *inter alia*, the need to align NAPAs with national development policy. Referring to barriers to engaging the private sector in climate change investment, such as low returns for high risk, he said the public sector can leverage private sector finance by addressing public needs such as national security, social safety and natural risks.

Sven Harmeling, Germanwatch, reported on the Adaptation Fund established under the Kyoto Protocol, highlighting that, *inter alia*: it is the first multilateral climate fund to provide direct access for developing countries; one of its strategic priorities is the most vulnerable peoples; and its governance structure includes a developing country majority. He described the Adaptation Fund NGO network, noting its aim to support NGOs in developing countries focus on direct access to funding, and its role in providing feedback to the Adaptation Fund Board and performing a watchdog function.

Hassan Mahmood, Minister for Environment and Forests, Bangladesh, said Bangladesh is the most vulnerable country in relation to climate change. He said if scientific predictions about sea-level rises are correct, then by 2050 an estimated 30

million people will be displaced. Noting that the government has prioritized climate change adaptation, with US\$100 million being allocated in the last budget, he said the country is trying to "help itself" and is working on increasing resilience adaptive capacity. Lamenting the lack of support from the global community, he stressed that developing countries are not responsible but are the innocent victims of climate change.

Discussion: In the ensuing discussion, Celine Herweijer noted that the private sector needs help in understanding what an adaptation investment would look like and suggested UNEP's Finance Initiative and other groups could have a role in this. Several panelists and participants referred to the need for increased public-private partnerships and dialogue, with Marion Verles noting an increased appetite for private sector involvement. On scaling-up the Adaptation Fund, Harmeling agreed on the need for more financing, preferring additional donor contributions to a new mechanism. In response to a question about linkages between the Adaptation Fund and the new climate fund proposed under the Copenhagen Accord, he said deliberations on the new fund are not concrete enough for there to be clarity on this.

For more information, contact:

Remy Paris <remy.paris@oecd.org> and Simon Anderson <simon.anderson@iied.org>

CLOSE OF THE MEETING

On Sunday afternoon, 5 December, Saleemul Huq, IIED, thanked all speakers and participants for their engagement, noting that many people had stayed throughout the entire two days. He declared the meeting closed shortly after 5:00 pm.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

12th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board: The

Adaptation Fund Board was established as the operating entity of the Adaptation Fund with the mandate to supervise and manage the Adaptation Fund under the authority and guidance of the COP/MOP to the Kyoto Protocol. At its 12th meeting, the Adaptation Fund Board will discuss several project proposals submitted for funding, and the accreditation of further implementing entities, among other matters. The Board will also engage in a dialogue with representatives from the civil society at the end of the meeting. **dates:** 13-15 December 2010 **location:** Cancún (Quintana Roo), Mexico **contact:** Marcia Levaggi **phone:** +1-202-473-6390 **e-mail:** mlevaggi@TheGEF.org **www:** <http://adaptation-fund.org/>

Fifth International Conference on Community-Based

Adaptation: The conference aims to share and consolidate the latest developments in CBA planning and practice in different sectors and countries among practitioners, policy makers, researchers, funders and the communities at risk. **dates:** 24-31 March 2011 **location:** Bangladesh **contact:** Saleemul Huq, Hannah Reid, IIED **e-mails:** saleemul.huq@iied.org or hannah.reid@iied.org

Twenty-Sixth Session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum: The 26th session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF) of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) is scheduled to convene from 21-25 February 2011, at the UN Office in Nairobi, Kenya. In pursuance of General Assembly resolution 53/242 (Report of the Secretary-General on environment and human settlements) of 28 July 1999, the

Governing Council constitutes the annual ministerial-level global environmental forum in which participants gather to review important and emerging policy issues in the field of the environment. **dates:** 21-25 February 2011 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** Secretary, Governing Bodies, UNEP **phone:** +254-20-762-3431 **fax:** +254-20-762-3929 **e-mail:** sgc.sgb@unep.org **www:** <http://www.unep.org/resources/gov/overview.asp>

AfricaAdapt Climate Change Symposium: This symposium will take as its theme, "Linking climate research, policy and practice for African-led development." Issues to be covered include the roles of local and indigenous knowledge, community-led responses, the roles of media and intermediaries, linking policy and practice, and links between adaptation, mitigation and low-carbon climate-compatible development. **dates:** 9-11 March 2011 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** AfricaAdapt **e-mail:** info@africaadapt.net **www:** <http://www.adaptation2011.net>

CIF Partnership Forum: The Climate Investment Funds (CIF) Partnership Forum is an annual gathering of all stakeholders engaged in the CIF, which are financing instruments designed to support low-carbon and climate-resilient development through scaled-up financing channeled through the African Development Bank (AfDB), Asian Development Bank (ADB), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and World Bank Group. **dates:** 14-18 March 2011 **location:** Tunis, Tunisia **contact:** CIF Admin Unit **phone:** +1-202-458-1801 **e-mail:** CIFAdminUnit@worldbank.org **www:** <http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/>

11th Session of IPCC Working Group III: This meeting of WGIII is scheduled to take place immediately prior to IPCC 33. **dates:** 5-8 May 2011 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **e-mail:** ipcc-sec@wmo.int **www:** http://www.ipcc.ch/calendar_of_meetings/calendar_of_meetings

UN/ISDR Third Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Reduction: Based on lessons emerging from the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA),

the meeting will discuss what the disaster risk reduction (DRR) framework will look like post-2015, both in terms of governance, resources, monitoring and compliance; and how it will fit with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and climate change framework. **dates:** 8-13 May 2011 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **phone:** +41-229-178-908 **fax:** +41-229-178-964 **e-mail:** isdr@un.org **www:** <http://business.un.org/en/needs/902>

IPCC 33: The 33rd session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 33) and approval of the Special Report on Renewable Energy are expected to take place in May 2011. **dates:** 10-13 May 2011 [tentative] **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates [tentative] **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **e-mail:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** http://www.ipcc.ch/calendar_of_meetings/calendar_of_meetings

GLOSSARY

BCAS	Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies
CBA	Community-based adaptation
CBO	Community-based organization
COP	Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC
COP/MOP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IISD	International Institute for Sustainable Development
LDCs	Least developed countries
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action
NGOs	Non-governmental organizations
REDD	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries
REDD-plus	Reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries, including conservation
SEI	Stockholm Environment Institute
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change



Development and Climate Days participants during the interactive session on communicating climate change.